

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

Editor : DOM BEDE WINSLOW

Associate Editor : DONALD ATTWATER

CONTENTS

	<i>pages</i>
ST. THOMAS AND CHRISTIAN TRADITIONS	
<i>Fr. Victor White, O.P.</i>	51
PLATONISM AS A VITAL FORCE IN CATHOLIC THEOLOGY	
<i>Professor Hilary Armstrong</i>	56
INTEGRAL CATHOLICISM AND THE <i>E.C.Q.</i>	
<i>Dom Bede Winslow</i>	66
REVIEW OF REVIEWS - - - - -	78
NEWS AND COMMENTS - - - - -	82
LETTER TO THE EDITOR - - - - -	84
BOOKS RECEIVED - - - - -	86

SINGLE COPIES 2/- YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION 8/- POST FREE
U.S.A. AND CANADA 2 dollars

London Agents : Geo. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., 17 Red Lion Square,
Holborn, London, W.C.1, to whom all subscriptions are to
be paid, except those from U.S.A.

U.S.A. Agent : The Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare
Association, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review
should be addressed to the Editor *E.C.Q.*, St. Augustine's
Abbey, Ramsgate.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"*
founded 1931.)

VOL. VI

APRIL-JUNE, 1945

No. 2

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY CONFERENCE

(Continued—See last issue, p. 8.)

St. Thomas and the Christian Tradition

By THE REV. VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

A REPORT.¹

FATHER VICTOR WHITE explained at the outset of his paper that his subject matter might well be thought irrelevant to the dominant theme of the Conference; moreover, that it was not only irrelevant, but even antipathetic. Neither scholastic thought in general nor St. Thomas in particular was held by some to promote further understanding between East and West. Indeed, the raising of such questions served only to widen the breach. In such an atmosphere no Orthodox could breathe. In fact the only possible way to proceed to build a bridge was to return to the Fathers and firmly disregard every later development.

It was to answer these contentions that Father Victor White's review of St. Thomas in relation to patristic thought and tradition was principally devoted; and, apart from a brief historical summary of the state of mind prevalent from the end of the great conciliar epoch down to the beginnings of Scholasticism in St. Anselm, the paper was solely concerned with those aspects of St. Thomas's thought which could be held to link him with, and root him in, that common Christian past from which both Eastern and Western Christendom draw their sustenance.

¹ Unfortunately Father Victor had not written out his paper. A friend kindly undertook to make a report. This article is based on that report and was submitted to Father Victor who approved of it.—THE EDITOR.

The speaker began by describing the condition of theological thought from the end of the patristic period down to the middle of the eleventh century, pointing out the relative stagnation of this period and its dominance by a stifling traditionalism which substituted mere quotation for original thought and preferred comparing text and counter-text to reasoned argument. During this period, quotations from the Fathers became a despotic authority, accepted uncritically, which prevented any original thought on the subject matter of revelation.

But, between the middle of the eleventh century and the middle of the twelfth, a change is to be noticed which gave birth to a new way of thinking, since called Scholasticism. In essence, this movement was the recognition, at first a slow one, of the possibility of thoughtful consideration of the data of revelation. Subsequently, it was seen that this new critical approach was not merely possible but necessary. Undoubtedly the discovery of the works of Aristotle did much to provoke this change; but the original work done by Abelard, Anselm and finally St. Thomas himself was the mainspring from which the whole trend of scholastic thought received its impetus.

Abelard, noticeably in his *Sic et Non*, cleared the ground and showed at least that there was room for reconciliation between the, *prima facie*, contradictory statements of the Fathers, of which he made lists in parallel columns, bringing out the absurdity of argument on the sole basis of quotation. Thus, it was seen that there must be some function of the human mind to undertake this necessary work of reconciliation. But it was St. Anselm who advocated the use of *ratio* as the essential factor in theological thought, and who wrote:

“Although the holy Fathers and Doctors tell us so many and such great things concerning our Faith that we cannot hope that anyone either in our own day or in time to come will be their equals in the contemplation of truth, yet I do not think that anyone is blameworthy, provided he be firmly settled in his faith, should he wish to make further investigations. For the days of a man’s life are numbered, and those holy Doctors were not able, within the short span of their lives, to say everything that might be said. Truth is so vast and so deep that it cannot be exhausted by any mortal man; nor has Our Lord, who has promised to abide with His Church till the end of the world, ceased to impart His gifts.”

He believed that theology should apply the methods of rhetoric and logic for a deeper understanding of, and greater insight into, the truths of revelation as handed down through the patristic tradition.

This trend of thought reached its most complete exposition in the pages of St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica*; and it is an important, although frequently overlooked, fact that in the first Question the author straightway discusses the nature of theology, the relation of reason to faith, and the precise function and place of the Fathers. The most significant Article in this respect is the eighth, where St. Thomas distinguishes the three functions of reason in theology: to argue from articles of faith to other truths; to argue with heretics, i.e., with those who deny one article of faith while accepting others; to answer the objections against faith of those who believe nothing of divine revelation. Moreover, in his Reply to the second Objection in this eighth Article, St. Thomas deals explicitly with the question of authority and the standing of the Fathers. Here, St. Thomas lays down an important principle: that we ought to accept unconditionally only those arguments from authority whose principles are obtained by revelation, on the authority of those to whom the revelation has been made. The place of reason is not to prove faith, but to clarify matters put forward in sacred doctrine. The distinction which must be kept clear is that between the authority of direct revelation and of the canonical Scriptures and that of the doctors of the Church. "For our faith rests upon the revelation made to the apostles and prophets, who wrote the canonical books, and not on the revelations (if any such there are) made to other doctors."

Thus, theology makes use of the Fathers, not discarding them, but reading them for the enlightenment of our own minds and as witnesses to revelation. Here, St. Thomas follows Augustine from whom he quotes:

"Only those books of Scripture which are called canonical have I learnt to hold in such honour as to believe their authors have not erred in any way in writing them. But other authors I so read as not to deem anything in their works to be true, merely on account of their having so thought and written, what ever may have been their holiness and learning."

St. Thomas combines reverence and freedom in his attitude to the Fathers. He reveres them because they were holy men, close to God and recognized by the Church. For these reasons,

their thoughts about God are not lightly to be set aside. But, at the same time, he feels free to criticise patristic writings because their authors were not immediate recipients of divine revelation.

To distinguish clearly the principles according to which, and the ways in which, St. Thomas makes use of the Fathers, the *Summa* must be studied as a whole. Such a study enables us to classify the author's treatment of the Fathers under four heads, which may be named: quotation; interpretation; co-ordination; and synthesis.

Father Victor White then gave a brief review of each of these four approaches with examples of each, taken from the *Summa Theologica*.

St. Thomas's use of quotations from the Fathers is obvious throughout the *Summa*. It is, however, important to note that, despite their frequent use as illustrations or in support of arguments, quotations do not play the same decisive, authoritative rôle as was customary earlier in, for instance, Peter Lombard and the other Books of "Sentences." From a study of St. Thomas's use of quotation we learn too how permeated is his own thought with that of the Fathers, and we see him essentially in the patristic tradition and not merely a critic outside it. The very questions which he raises are formed by, and related to, his reading of the Fathers and are often the same questions which had been discussed in patristic times.

In addition, we find St. Thomas interpreting, where he thought necessary, the original statements of the Fathers. In these cases, he is concerned to elucidate what a Father really meant, particularly in the light of subsequent reflection and discussion within the Church. In many cases, the fact that the Fathers were engaged in particular controversies or writing to particular persons led them to exaggerate and put the emphasis too markedly on one side of the argument. The *Summa*, however, from its very character, required a less biased focus; and St. Thomas, when incorporating patristic material, allows for this need in his interpretation of the original. Much of this interpretation was concerned with the meaning of words, meanings which required revaluation either because of the passage of time or in order to correlate an earlier term with the new terminology derived from the influx of Aristotelian thought.

Finally, when we consider examples of the two headings co-ordination and synthesis, it is not always easy to make a

clear distinction between them. Under co-ordination, however, must be included St. Thomas's exposition of an argument in which he has drawn upon many different Fathers, embodying their ideas on a given subject in a new logical coherence. An admirable example of this tendency is the treatment of the need and purpose of the Incarnation in Part III, Question I, Second Article.

By synthesis Father Victor White explained that he meant St. Thomas's practice of co-ordinating two opposing tendencies of thought which, left to develop unchecked, would each lead to heresy. An example of such opposing tendencies is to be found in the divergence of views with regard to the Eucharist to be found in St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, where Ambrose emphasizes rather the physical reality of the Real Presence and of the Body and Blood of Christ, while Augustine is preoccupied with their specifically sacramental nature as symbols whereby faith sees through the veil to the reality beyond. St. Thomas believed that either of these views taken by itself and pushed to extremes would become heretical, but that both were necessary in a modified form to give a full insight into the mystery of the Blessed Sacrament. His doctrine of transubstantiation synthesised the two views and preserved the essential truth in each of them.

Father Victor White closed his talk by considering a few of the tasks to be accomplished to-day in the light of the estimation of St. Thomas's position which he had outlined.

Firstly, it was important to see St. Thomas in proper historical perspective, firmly placed in that Christian tradition which itself went back to the Fathers. To understand St. Thomas's thought we must read him against his own background, including the Fathers, rather than in the distorting light of later ideas. To do this, we must study those writers, whether Eastern or Western, whom St. Thomas himself studied. Thus, we have in St. Thomas a powerful aid in the understanding of the questions with which the Eastern Fathers were preoccupied and with which the Orthodox are still familiar. Secondly, theologians must continue the work begun by St. Thomas by making use of the vast accumulation of patristic material which has been amassed since his day.

In this connection, it was important to note that St. Thomas rarely used material dating from earlier than the fourth century. The works of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Cyprian were known to him only through his reading of Augustine.

In conclusion, Father Victor White urged that we should not use St. Thomas merely as a text, just as St. Thomas himself had not so used the Fathers.

The address was followed by a lively discussion.

C.H.V.

PLATONISM AS A VITAL FORCE IN CATHOLIC THEOLOGY

THE scope of this paper has been determined for me by its title. I have been asked to speak on "Platonism as a Vital Force in Catholic Theology." I have not therefore devoted it to the narrower, though fascinating and important question of how far Plato himself was read and understood in the Christian West in the Middle Ages, to the Latin translations and commentaries of his works.¹ Nor have I concentrated on what is sometimes called the "Platonist" tradition of Western Catholic theology, the tradition of St. Augustine and St. Bonaventure, as opposed to the "Aristotelian." I have rather tried to concern myself with those ideas and ways of thinking which have influenced the Catholic theological tradition as a whole and are still a living force in it and which may be regarded as deriving from, or having been affected by Platonism.

It is obviously necessary first of all to define what we mean by "Platonism," a word which has been and still is used to mean a surprisingly large number of different things, from high metaphysics of rather varied kinds to occultism or aesthetic sentimentality. The Platonism with which developing Catholic theology came into contact was not of course the Platonism of Plato. It was the Platonism of the Platonic revival of the first three centuries A.D. and of the later Neo-Platonists Iamblichus and his successors, though the effects produced by contact with these latter were of less importance. Plato's own Dialogues were read in the light of this complex development of Platonism, with its many Aristotelian and some Stoic elements; and they continued to be so read and interpreted by Christian thinkers generally down to the end of the seventeenth century or later. One consequence of this was that the scanty supply

¹ On this see R. Klibansky's essay "The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition," an invaluable introduction to the subject.

of Latin translations of Plato's own works in the Middle Ages made little difference to the "Platonic" content of Catholic theology, which depended mainly on indirect tradition, on the absorption of later Platonism by the Fathers, and especially by St. Augustine.

It will be convenient first of all to define the content of the earlier and simpler form of revived Platonism (Middle Platonism, with the closely related and very similar movement of Neo-Pythagoreanism) before discussing a very important indirect route by which some Platonic ideas penetrated into Catholic theology, the thought of Philo the Jew of Alexandria. First we may note some basic ideas which this later Platonism takes from Plato himself without serious change. These are: the spirituality or immateriality of God (or the gods) and the soul; a more or less sharp dualism between soul and body; and the conception of the gradual purification and ascent of the soul to pure intellectual contemplation, which is the divine life. And it may be as well to add here a general caution. It is very easy to read too much Christianity into the pagan Platonists. But in certain respects their thought is always true to the general Greek tradition and thoroughly opposed to Christianity. They all assert as a matter of course the eternity of the cosmos or at least its elements and have no real idea of creation. Nor have they any real idea of an Absolute (though there are beginnings of it in Plotinus and Damascius). Their supreme principle is head of the cosmic system, and Supreme and Cosmos are co-eternal and co-necessary. The word "God" never means the same thing for pagan and Christian Platonists.

The Supreme Principle in Middle Platonism is, historically considered, a fusion of Plato's One-Good and Aristotle's Self-Thinking Mind (the transcendent First Mover) which was helped by Xenocrates's doctrine of the Good which was also Monad and Mind. The Forms (Ideas) in Middle Platonism are the thoughts of this Supreme Principle or First God, who is prior to them in the sense that he is their eternal cause. The First God is, like Aristotle's Unmoved Mover, not active in the cosmos. He is remote, utterly transcendent, hardly accessible to human thought. In the second century A.D., Middle Platonist, Albinus, there even appears a crude and undeveloped form of the "negative theology" which Plotinus was to develop. Below the First in the hierarchy of intelligible being is a Second God, an active principle like

Plato's Craftsman in the "Timaeus," who forms the visible world on the pattern of the Forms which he contemplates, and who, in the system of the late Neo-Pythagorean Numenius, seems to derive his own reality from his contemplation of the First. Below him again comes the immanent Soul of the World (again as in the "Timaeus"). This idea of a hierarchy of intermediaries between the Supreme Principle and the visible world is very important in all later Platonism. Sometimes it takes a more popular form, the ranks of intermediaries being filled by the gods of mythology and astrology and below them the "daemones," beings intermediate in nature between gods and men and acting as go-betweens connecting us with the higher ranks of the spiritual world.

Philo the Jew of Alexandria who wrote enormous allegorical commentaries on the Scriptures in which he made much use of Greek philosophical ideas, in the earlier part of the first century A.D., was a very powerful influence on the first Christian theologians. He was first of all a commentator on the Sacred Scriptures (whose method influenced greatly that of later Christian commentators) and was also believed to have been friendly to Christianity. Through his thought some Greek ideas of much importance passed to the Christian theologians, but he is both in his thinking and the form of his work essentially Jewish and not Greek. His doctrine of the Logos has of course been endlessly discussed. For our present purposes it will be enough to note that the Logos is an instrumental intermediary used by God in His creation of the world and that it is itself the archetypal world of Forms. Sometimes Philo speaks of it as a sort of preliminary plan or "blueprint" formed (not in time) by God as a first stage in His work of creation. Philo, we can see, is using the contemporary doctrine of intermediaries and is also bringing the archetypal world of Forms, however oddly, into connection with the Old Testament doctrine of creation by the will of God. This juxta-position was a fact of cardinal importance for the development of Christian theology. Philo also had a real mystical doctrine of how the soul, though it could not by nature know God as He is in Himself, but only in a multiple image or reflection, yet might be rapt by divine power beyond reason and intellectual contemplation to a higher, obscure, apprehension; and this too made an important contribution to Christian thought. Philo is an author who is treated with much contempt and hostility by many writers on ancient

thought, and indeed he is often remarkably muddle-headed and inconsistent and exceedingly tiresome to read owing, among other things, to a strong addiction to endless discourses on the esoteric significance of numbers. But I think Christian readers should regard him with some friendship and respect, for he transmitted to the Fathers a number of permanently valuable ideas.

What contributions then, permanent or transient, did this earlier phase of revived Platonism make to Catholic theology? Its first great service, I think, was that it "believed in metaphysics"; that is, it believed in the existence of an intelligible spiritual world about which we can think rationally and truly. Platonic influence helped greatly to deliver Christianity from a very real danger of materialism (how real it was we can see from some of Tertullian's works, the *Adv. Hermogenem*, the first two books against Marcion, and the *De Anima*, where he expounds a thoroughly materialist theology, under Stoic influence, and also from Origen's repeated insistence on the spirituality of God, and the later popularity of the crudely materialist Manichaean religion). It also asserted the possibility of a rational theology, of some sort of knowledge of things invisible, however different the Christian doctrine of knowledge of the divine may be from the Platonic. Rational theology owes its first impulse to Platonism.

As regards the nature of God, Platonism asserted the divine transcendence in an inadequate and sometimes misleading way, but one which was helpful to nascent Catholic theology. It could not supply the necessary perception of God as Absolute Being, nor yet as creator; though it helped on the way to the philosophical expression of both. Christian theologians have of course sometimes "found" these doctrines in Platonism, by reading them into it. Throughout the great period of Christian theology the method of interpretation of authorities has been profoundly unhistorical by the standards of a modern historian of philosophy. This has been a great benefit, allowing much fruitful interaction which would otherwise have been impossible. But it means that, just as the Middle Platonists transformed Plato, the Christians far more radically transformed Middle Platonism. Besides this unconscious transformation, too, even the most Platonist theologian never put Plato beside Scripture and Tradition. He remained a pagan who had gleams of the truth, and much of what he said was to be uncompromisingly rejected. But as regards the

nature and transcendence of God, I think that unconscious transmutation is more in evidence than conscious rejection.

The doctrine of the Forms as eternal archetypes of all things in the mind of God has been and still is an essential part of all Catholic philosophical theology, to be found in St. Thomas as well as in St. Augustine and St. Bonaventure. Its Christian development has two important aspects: first the connection of the world of Forms especially with the Son, the Logos, Wisdom, ἀπαύγασμα or *expressio* of the Father (here of course we can see the influence of the Book of Wisdom which so deeply penetrated New Testament theology, and in a lesser degree in some early theologians the influence of Philo). Revelation here gives a Platonic doctrine a far profounder meaning than it could ever have had to a pagan Platonist. Then there is the distinctively Christian form of Exemplarism. For the Christian theologian the most important meaning of the doctrine of Forms is that all things, above all men, are images of God. This has become much more important for Christians than it was for pagan Platonists: the latter, however good they may have thought the visible world (and in the spirit of the "Timaeus" they did affirm its goodness and perfection), "by-passed" it by their theory of knowledge and sought to free the mind from it as soon as possible and transcend it in the search for God. The Incarnation altered all that. The visible world became for Christians a language of God speaking to the soul, a book He has written for our instruction (St. Bonaventure). We find God through and in His images, though we too must transcend them; and the doctrine of creation makes God's relation to each created thing utterly different and infinitely more intimate than that of the Platonist's remote, self-centred Supreme. For the pagan Platonists the emphasis is on the Forms in the divine Mind as the ultimate objects of our knowledge; for the Christians it is on all things being images of the Forms in the divine Mind. Consequently Christians are not tied to any very rigid and literal form of the doctrine which might conflict with our faith in the divine simplicity.

The Platonic (and Aristotelian) idea of an intellectual contemplation of the divine prepared by moral purification helped Catholic theologians greatly in thinking about the life of prayer. But its influence has not been altogether good. The Platonic conception was too intellectualist and made no room for charity (Clement of Alexandria actually seems to

subordinate charity to knowledge as means to end). Yet here too the Platonic conception of Eros held a great truth which Catholic theology has used, that all men by nature desire God at least implicitly as the supreme Good and Desirable, and are moved by that desire (which of course the gift of supernatural charity can alone enable us to fulfil). Another disadvantage of the Platonic conception was that it involved a sharp dualism of body and soul contrary to the religion of the Incarnation. The Platonic attitude to the body and the material world is utterly distinct from and opposed to the black pessimism of the Gnostics. But Platonic influence can lead, and has led, to a depreciation in practice in the spiritual life of the humanity of our Lord, of His life in the Mystical Body, and of the sacraments and outward and visible worship of the Church.

The Middle Platonists were generally agreed that man cannot have a direct contemplation of God in this life. This fitted in well with Christian doctrine and was generally adopted, an exception sometimes being made in the case of "raptus," the highest supernatural ecstasy, of which Moses and St. Paul were the traditional examples. The indirect contemplation of God in the mirror of the purified mind, by means, that is, of a very perfect image, of which St. Athanasius and other Eastern Fathers speak, has interesting analogies in Philo and Plotinus.

I have said nothing about the well-worn topic of the Subordinationism of the Apologists and of some later writers, because it is certainly not a vital element in Catholic theology. It was an unfortunate inheritance, mainly I think from Philonic Logos-doctrine, helped out by the Middle Platonist idea of a Second God, and was soon expelled from the main theological tradition.

We must next consider the influence of the first and greatest of the Neo-platonists, Plotinus, incomparably the greatest of all pagan Platonists. I can only give a very brief and inadequate sketch of his profound and complex philosophy. At the head of his system stands the transcendent One, beyond being and thought, which even the Divine Mind, his Second Hypostasis, can only attain to in ecstasy. This Second Hypostasis is the One-Being, the One which is, a Mind which contains and is informed by the World of Forms (a pluralised reflection or multiple and so inadequate image of the One). It is thus the most perfect unity-in-multiplicity. The Forms are them-

selves living and intelligent, each thinking and mirroring the others, so that each is in all and all in each, and there is complete interpenetration of parts and of whole and part. Plotinus insists that there are forms of individuals, not only of genera and species. Below the Divine Mind comes the Third Hypostasis, the Great Soul, the transcendent orderer of the visible world (sometimes this function is fulfilled, in two late treatises, by a transcendent Logos), and subordinate to it the Immanent Soul or Nature. The Three Hypostases are not rigidly separated or cut off from each other. They are of course co-eternal and co-necessary, and are subordinated one to the other in a hierarchy of increasing degrees of multiplicity, from the Absolute One down to the extreme pluralisation of soul concerned with the separate material entities of the visible world. Each Hypostasis is related to the one above it by an eternal cyclic movement. It is emanated or radiated from the higher hypostasis as a potentiality and returns upon it in contemplation, and through contemplation becomes actualised and receives its form from the higher, becoming what it thinks as in Aristotle's psychology. The whole process is automatic and necessary; the production of the lower hypostasis is a reflex action of the contemplation which is the proper and primary activity of the higher hypostasis. Soul is the traveller of Plotinus's spiritual world, able to ascend by its own powers to become the Divine Mind and to the rare union with the One. The One for Plotinus is really outside the cosmos, beyond and wholly other, though being a good Greek he is always trying to tie it down and bring it into the system. But some of his descriptions suggest a real perception of a supernatural Absolute. With the One we can only enter into union by ecstasy, by passing beyond even the highest intellectual contemplation and "leaving ourselves behind"; and this comes only very rarely and not altogether by our own power.

At the other end of the scale Plotinus strongly defends the goodness of the visible world against the Gnostics, but emphasises its lowliness in the scale of reality. The forms in matter are the last traces of spiritual being and they are "dead," incapable of further spiritual productivity because non-contemplative. They do not really unite with matter as in Aristotle to form a concrete substance, but are simply superimposed upon it. In the spiritual world Plotinus asserts the existence of an "intelligible matter" which does

perfectly receive the form and unite with it, an idea closely related to his account of the generation of the hypostases. About the matter of the visible world he is rather incoherent. Sometimes it is a purely negative principle, the element of not-being or potentiality, and sometimes it becomes an active principle of evil. The visible cosmos is for him an organic living being, eternal as a whole, in which all happenings are determined by the rhythm of its life. Hence he believes in magic (though not in its power over the soul of the philosopher, who can transcend the visible world); and the only kind of "prayer" he recognises is magical incantation, in which one part of the organic whole affects another through the universal "sympathy."

Some new elements which entered Catholic theology through the influence of Plotinus are of great importance. First, there was a great stress on the Transcendent Unity of God. Some approach to this emphasis is already apparent in Clement of Alexandria, where the influence is perhaps Neo-Pythagorean. But Plotinus's far profounder doctrine could add a good deal more. His One-Good, though "beyond being," really *is* in the most positive and absolute sense, and is a One Life. Unity for him is the principle and source of Being and Life. This is a principle of great value in Catholic theology. It is prominent in the thought of St. Augustine, and there is no doubt that the positive side of Plotinus's doctrine of the One contributed to clarifying our ideas about God's Transcendent and Absolute Being. One form of Plotinus's "negative theology" which I have elsewhere called the "negative theology of positive transcendence" has passed almost unaltered into Catholic theology. (Of course for Catholic theologians God was always from the beginning Being, He Who Is; they could say that He transcends all knowable existents, but could not flatly deny Him Being as Plotinus sometimes does to the One.) Plotinus's vision of the One-Being contributed something to our vision of the Word; though Neo-Platonic influence on the development of Trinitarian theology was not in my opinion as great as some have thought. St. Augustine and other Fathers read the Christian doctrine of the Blessed Trinity into Plotinus and his successors with the utmost assurance; but there are of course essential and obvious differences. One, apart from the extreme subordinationism of Plotinus's system (to use the language of a theology to which he owed no allegiance and from which his thought was

alien) was the fact that according to revealed and defined Christian doctrine the Father eternally generates the Son in the fulness of His Godhead by that very generation. The Son does not acquire the fulness of His divine Being by His eternal return upon the Father in contemplation like Plotinus's One-Being or Divine Mind. There are very deep implications in this difference and it has not, I think, usually been remarked. The Christian Perichoresis is something very different from the Neo-Platonic cycle of outgoing and return.

Plotinus's doctrine of Soul transcendent and immanent in the visible world certainly contributed something to our understanding of the work *ab extra* appropriated to the Holy Ghost. St. Augustine and St. Basil both use it in this way. His whole doctrine of immanence and transcendence, of the One intimately near yet wholly other, which really does away with the need for the intermediate hypostases, of is the very greatest and most permanent value. So is his profound understanding of the nature of spiritual being, of the interpenetration of spirits and how the lower can in a sense become the higher by contemplating it. All Plotinus's thought is inward and spiritual, concerned with the life of the soul, and this inward-looking character deeply influenced Catholic spirituality through St. Augustine. Plotinus's doctrine of ecstasy, again, influenced the language and thought of Christian writers about mystical states. The great saints and doctors of the mystical life have gone far beyond Plotinus and seen a mystical way of which his rare ecstasy is only an early stage; and they have seen that even this mystical way at the highest point it can reach in this life stops far short of the Beatific Vision. Yet Plotinus's doctrine of intellect carried away by love ceasing to be itself, of the passage beyond conscious thought to the desired union with the One is in itself a high one. And he sees, at least sometimes, that this must come by the will of the Supreme, not by our will.

In his doctrine about the visible world Plotinus gave to Catholic theology perhaps only one important contribution, the doctrine of the Scale of Unity. This is that there is an order and hierarchy, a harmonious proportion in the reality we know where the One is imaged in number; and that this is so because things exist only as unities of some sort, images however distant of the One, and are held together in larger unities, up to and including that of the Cosmos. But his organic-determinist view of the eternal Cosmos could give nothing to Christian thought.

To sum up, then, Platonism has been and still is a living influence in Catholic theology in the following ways : (i) by insisting on the possibility of a rational theology ; (ii) by clarifying the nature of spiritual being and confirming the spirituality of God and the soul ; (iii) by insistence on the transcendent unity of God ; (iv) by Exemplarism, the doctrine of the archetypal Forms in the divine Mind (which for Christians must be also the Supreme One) ; this has taken a particularly Christian and Incarnational direction, and has helped to form the distinctively Christian doctrine of divine Images ; (v) by Plotinus's teaching about the immanent transcendence of the Supreme, wholly present because wholly other ; (vi) by its doctrine of moral and intellectual purification as the necessary road to contemplation of the divine, which is good in itself as far as it goes (we who talk self-confidently about divine things very badly need to remember it), but has not had always good results, for here we come against the great difference between pagan and Christian thought which is made by the Incarnation ; (vii) by Plotinus's doctrine about ecstasy, which has often helped and inspired Catholic mystical writers directly or indirectly, though the saints have gone beyond it. None of these doctrines are present in Catholic theology in their pure Platonic form. They have been digested and transmuted into Christianity, yet they keep a real connection with their origin.

Finally I shall try to relate this paper to the purpose of this conference. What help can an emphasis on the Platonic element in Catholic theology be towards reunion ? It will obviously not be helpful towards an understanding with those who, for whatever reason and in whatever way, reject the possibility of a true metaphysic or of rational theology. But the Catholic Church is absolutely committed to belief in the possibility of a rational theology, and it is difficult to see what progress on any lines can be made to an understanding with those who absolutely reject it.

On the other side the Platonic element in Catholic theology forms a vital link (though by no means the only or even the most important one) with the world of the common Graeco-Roman culture, the world of the Fathers, which was a world in which a deep and real unity between East and West existed. By contrast, the full Aristotelian influence on Catholic theology came later, after the separation of East and West, and produced results less easy for the East to understand ; though we must

remember that there was a very large Aristotelian element in the Platonism which affected Catholic theology, and that all the Platonic features mentioned above are to be found in the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. There is much truth in Dr. Inge's judgment: "St. Thomas is nearer to Plotinus than to the real Aristotle." We may perhaps add that St. Thomas is sometimes nearer to the earlier, more Platonic Aristotle (the Aristotle e.g., of the conclusion of the "Eudemian Ethics") than to the later. However that may be, it does seem that attention to these living Platonic elements in Catholic theology provides one important means (only one) of regaining vital contact with the minds of the Fathers from whom all our theology springs, and so of recovering a fuller and more integral understanding of Catholicism. By doing so we shall make understanding easier between ourselves and those others whose theological traditions derive from the great Christian Platonist Fathers: that is, with most perhaps of the Orthodox and with some Anglicans; for in the Church of England Christian Platonism has always been a living force.

A. H. ARMSTRONG.

INTEGRAL CATHOLICISM AND THE *E.C.Q.*

THE *E.C.Q.* has from the beginning, i.e., from 1936, and even during the five years that it enjoyed the hospitality of *Pax* (1931-1935), based its policy on the letter *Rerum Orientalium* (8th September, 1928) of Pope Pius XI, in which the pope sketches the field of work aimed at by the Oriental Institute in Rome and urges the need for centres of Oriental studies among Western Catholics. Of the advantages of which the pope says: "And in this way from the consciousness of *Oriental doctrines and rites* in the minds of the young priests not a little profit is to be expected for the Church—profit not only to the advantage of the Orientals, but also for the Western clergy itself, who will thus naturally more adequately understand Catholic theology and the Latin discipline while conceiving a more ardent love for the true Spouse of Christ, whose enchanting comeliness in the diversity of the various rites they would thus perceive in greater wealth and splendour." (ibid., p. 12). The same

pope had said, in a previous consistorial allocution (18th December, 1924), that "the work of reconciliation can be carried on with success only if we eradicate from our minds our false notions concerning the belief and institutions of the Eastern Churches, and study to find the real agreement in matters of Faith between the Eastern and the Latin Fathers." (cf., A.A.S., xvi, 495).

Also Pope Benedict XV, who founded the Oriental Institute, wished that Orthodox students as well as Oriental and Western Catholics should study there together the holy Traditions of the Christian East. (cf., A.A.S. ix, pars. i. 531).

Taking this lead from the popes the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* aims at placing before an English-reading public such a complete exposition of Catholic Tradition, both of the West and the East, discovering also the true tradition of the Orthodox and other Eastern Churches not in communion with the Holy See, so that an evergrowing informed opinion may be established among Catholics who will desire to share in the heritage of the Christian East and so become conscious of that integral Catholicism which alone is worthy of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.

The separation of East and West which was effected in and since the eleventh century had been a deep and festering wound in the side of the Catholic Church, so that Roman Catholicism had to a large extent developed herself without any *real* understanding of the value of Eastern traditions, with the result that the West became more and more estranged from the Christian East. The one exception to this general indifference to the Eastern half of Christendom, throughout the whole of our history, has been the popes. They have always desired union with the East; they always knew that by disunion the Church had suffered a very great loss; perhaps they were not always clear as to what this loss was, or as to how reunion should be brought about (and they were always hampered by the circumstances of the times, whether political or other, in the West), but the desire was always there. However, a real and more general interest began to develop from the time of Pope Benedict XIV, and this especially took shape under Leo XIII and has grown with successive popes ever since. This interest on the part of the popes, lesser authorities, and the people at large, has been a gradual process, beginning with the simple recognition of the right of Eastern Catholics to use their ancient liturgies for worship, to the full conscious-

ness that the Oriental rites stand for something much more than ritual ceremonies, and the Greek Fathers for more than a basis of academic argument.

We would say frankly that now is the time to develop the interest hitherto shown, into a movement, and that all the foundations for such a movement are to be found mainly in the official teaching and guidance of Popes Leo XIII, Benedict XV and Pius XI, and the present Holy Father has certainly confirmed this statement. (vid. his Encyclical *Orientalis Ecclesiae*).

Now the change of something that was but the interest of the few into the interest of the many and so into a movement, is of the utmost importance and it needs very careful considering. The first need, of course, is that of "well-informed prayer," hence the great value we should attach to the yearly keeping of the Church Unity Octave (January 18th to 25th). And the outcome of this should be, for all of us, an acquiring of what the early Christians called *μετάνοια* (i.e., a radical change of one's views of things, after perceiving that they were wrong, together with a life lived in accordance with this new and correct outlook on things). Some of us may have acquired this new attitude to our separated brethren, but we all need to deepen it. The acknowledgment that we (our forefathers and also ourselves) were and are still in many ways responsible for the Schism—this rending of the Body of Christ. Also we have to be prepared to learn from these dissident Eastern Churches (and from all our other separated brethren, for that matter), for they have retained much that we had failed to realize for a while, of whose value we are now only beginning to be conscious.

Let us consider the Catholicity of the Church from this angle. Père Congar explains it thus, concerning the Catholicity of the Church, "its *capacity*," he says, "is unlimited, but its *realization* must always be limited. In this sense of the actual realization of the Church's inherent Catholicity, we may truly say that the Church to-day is not now fully Catholic, and doubtless the Church here on earth never will be.

"The significance of this for the problem of reunion seems to us extremely important. It leads us to assert that the Church of Christ, *our* Church, though fully Catholic considered from the standpoint of its inherent dynamic potentialities and of its inward substance, yet in actual practice realizes that Catholicity only in an imperfect degree, the divisions of

Christendom being an important factor in this imperfect realization of Catholicity. That of which the separation of our brethren has deprived the Church, that which belongs to it and which they have realized and actualized outside its visible borders, is a loss to the outward actualization of its own Catholic capacities. Because the religious divisions have in a large measure been coextensive with ethnical and cultural groupings—because Russia (or Greece, etc.) is Orthodox and Scandinavia is Lutheran (England, Scotland could have been mentioned)—the Church is deprived of a Slav expression, a Norse expression (etc.), of the one and many-splendoured grace of Christ.” (*Divided Christendom*, 1939, p. 254).¹

The reunion then of the Orthodox Church with the Church of Rome would be the reintegration, the deepening of Rome’s own inherent Catholicity. And this applies in varying degrees in the case of other Christian bodies being brought into com-

¹ In case the above is misunderstood we add this further quotation from Père Congar :—

“ The Catholicity of its Head is the principal cause of the Catholicity of the Church. The one Church cannot but be Catholic : its unity comes from Christ and through Him from the Father. Its oneness is given by God precisely to restore into unity all the diversity of His creation : its Catholicity is precisely this capacity of unity to save, to fulfil, to bring back all humanity. The Church is Catholic exactly as she is one, in the same degree and by the same principle. The High Priestly prayer is the charter of Catholicity as of unity. ‘ The glory that thou gavest me have I given to them, that they may be one as we are one : I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in oneness ’ (John xvii, 22–3). This is the same as St. Paul’s doctrine of the fulness of the Godhead in bodily form, the Christ fulfilling all things, and making them one spiritual unity in Him. . . .

“ The dynamic universality of the divine truth of the faith handed down by the apostolic magisterium : not only is it capable of satisfying all minds, though dogma is the same for all ; not only is every fresh question and new aspect of truth which time reveals answered or incorporated without loss of coherence or detriment to unity ; but the apostolic faith answers those ultimate questionings of man which concern him and ‘ his all ’ as Pascal says, and thus it unifies him in his deepest self.”

Again : “ The unity of the Church has therefore a human embodiment, an institutional actuality willed by God, determined by Him in its essential structure, but adapted in accordance with human requirements and those historical, cultural and social conditions which are the study of Church historians.

“ This being granted, there is no need to labour the point that if it is of the essence of the Church spiritually to be one, if it is also of her essence, in the degree to which she is human, to have an unchangeable organ of unity, it is also proper to her to be adaptable to all the diverse human material which she must incorporate in order that it may be incorporated into Christ.” (*ibid.*, pp. 98–100).

munion with Rome. This is, of course, true in a certain sense, in considering any people or human cultural group. Christ needs to be expressed, as far as may be, in their own thought and in a way suited to their traditions—this certainly Pope Pius XI had in mind in specially urging a native clergy for India, China, Japan and Africa, etc. For the Church not only always tries to adapt herself in presenting the truth to these people, but her own Catholicity may be even said to be enlarged. This however has a far truer signification when it is a question of other Christian traditions and especially of the venerable Eastern Churches.

So then in a true spirit of *μετάνοια* we now approach the problem of Christian unity, acknowledging our own unworthiness because we bear part of the guilt, and our great desire that the Catholicity of the Church of God should be as completely as possible actualized, and that cannot be in a disunited Christendom. It is now that we can understand Our Lord's own prayer: "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." (St. John xvii, 21).

This new spirit of approach to the problem of Christian unity, this prayer—both of repentance and ardent desire for unity—must be on the part of all, for because this was not so in the past, history records how efforts for reunion planned even by the highest authorities came to nothing.

There is always then the danger of a group of workers for Christian unity becoming a clique divorced from the rank and file, and from the bishops and leaders of their own Churches; but the gradual growth of the faithful at large becoming interested and praying for the work of the experts will help them to keep the needed balance.

Now we come to the second need of what we have termed above the reunion movement, namely the importance of study. Concerning this, though, in connection with the Sword of the Spirit, Mr. Christopher Dawson has said: "—both Catholics and Englishmen are inclined to neglect the second intellectual arm and to undervalue the importance of the power of thought. The real reason of the success of the new powers that are conquering the world and the failure of Christians to withstand them has been that the former have used the intellectual arm to the fullest extent, however perverted their aim, whereas the Christians have been content with good intentions and

sound principles which they have accepted as a matter of course." (vid. *Judgement of the Nations*, p. 109).

In the first part of this paper we showed by referring to Pope Pius XI that the *E.C.Q.* aimed at helping its English reading public to come to know "Oriental doctrines and rites" from which they may "more adequately understand their own Catholic theology and the Latin discipline and so conceive a more ardent love for the true spouse of Christ." Also that they may "eradicate from their minds false notions concerning the belief and institutions of the Eastern Churches," and find by study that there is a real agreement in matters of Faith between the Eastern and the Latin Fathers. This will evidently demand the work of a student, a theologian, a liturgist, a philosopher and an historian, but besides these experts there is the need for accurate news, the report of the traveller, the account of one who can observe the manners and customs of the East, for psychology, politics, and social conditions have perhaps had more to do with our separation than the disputes of the theologians. Hence it is that the *E.C.Q.* does not aim at being merely a *learned review* dealing only with subjects of academic interest, however important such reviews may be. It is an ordinary intellectual outlook on the question that our quarterly purposes to give, which of course includes articles by experts and the findings of leading students.

At this point the question might be asked: what has the problem of the reunion of East and West to do with the English speaking people, to do with English and American Catholics (Irish and Scottish could equally be included)? There is one, at least, obvious reason in the case of the U.S.A. and Canada; in both countries there is a large number both of Catholics of the Oriental rites, of Orthodox, and members of other Eastern Churches. But what of British Catholics? The Near and Middle East look to England and so English Catholics have a duty to be interested in these countries. But besides this, we will be dealing with a new world in which the U.S.A. and the British Commonwealth are to play an international rôle. The English Catholics, because they are English, and possibly the American, may among other things, have to be the peacemakers between many a national Catholic and a national Orthodox group in Central Europe and elsewhere. And also there is the problem of Russia.

This question might, however, be answered in a more

simple way. Rome considers that the problem of the healing of the schism between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches is of the highest importance (just as the separation was the greatest disaster that befell the Church) so the energies of Catholics should be directed to this end; and since the Orthodox themselves regard the English with special favour, so English Catholics have a special part to play in this work.

It is then *at this point* that the *E.C.Q.* considers the *general problem* of Christian unity. What are the relations of the Orthodox with the Anglican Church, and what with the Oecumenical Movement? And this, in the final analysis means a consideration as to how far there is a real sacramental basis of unity between the various Christian bodies and the Catholic Church, and also how far there is an approximation to the deposit of Faith. Here of course the position between Rome and the Orthodox is that of a complete sacramental unity. In most other Christian bodies there is a sacramental unity based on baptism and a spiritual life built up on this. Here we are on the firm basis of the supernatural and we can hope that, if there is the desire for unity, the Holy Ghost will bring it about in His own time; we can but pray that we hinder not the work. How much of the divine revealed truth is to be found among these Christian groups is for the Catholic theologian to discover.

Having considered in general the aims of the *E.C.Q.* and the sort of work that it has got to tackle, we will now turn our attention to what may be called the vocation of the "reunionist" and his approach to this work. We have said that the time seems to indicate a movement in the direction of Christian unity; such a movement means that it should be on the part of the bulk of the people, clergy as well as laity, and this means popularization. Now popularization, even if one thinks only in connection with the reunion of the Orthodox with the Catholic Church, is a very difficult and delicate thing. A few of the dangers may be enumerated: it is so easy to treat the whole problem as a missionary activity, to think only in terms of individual conversions, and to regard Oriental rites as mere ceremonies and ritual practices, and this through want of historical knowledge and psychological equipment. Hence it is that we have stressed the great importance of the spread of the Unity Octave. This we think should be the main preoccupation for the greater part of the people; prayer, together with a simple instruction

on the object of the prayer, is the best way to bring about the right psychological approach to Christian unity. At the congress *Pro Oriente Christiano* held at Rome in 1937, the danger of a policy whose aim was quantitative rather than qualitative, a policy which is still far too common, was pointed out.¹ We think, however, the present crisis through which we are all going and the good work of the Sword of the Spirit in connection with Christian co-operation, has helped much to bring about a right attitude of mind on our part to other Christian bodies separated from us in this country. Nevertheless Pope Pius XI hoped for the spread of centres where the whole problem of the Christian East might be studied and from which right ideas might be spread abroad. We venture to claim that the *E.C.Q.* and those working in connection with it may be considered such a centre.

Obviously there have been and will be many writers in the *E.C.Q.* who, because they are experts in special subjects, are asked to write by the Editor, but there are besides these (though the first class is not excluded), others who may be considered of the group working for the review, a group whose views the review expresses. From the very beginning it has been the aim of the Editor to gather such a group round the review. It is concerning the ideals of such a group that we would now say a few words.

What follows is being told in this more formal way for the first time, though all the matter has been dealt with and advocated in the review many times, either directly or by publishing matter from continental reunionist reviews. The review may now be said to be beginning to define itself though obviously individuals are left free to express their own opinions.

We have used the term Integral Catholicism in the title of this paper because we think it expresses our ideals and is short. However, if we wish to consider the question carefully we had better study it under two headings: that of the eirenic method and that of the liturgical movement. The first may be said to be a *habit of mind*, the second a *principle of life*. We would say that the first is the outcome of the second, though this would be disputed by some. We will consider each in the order just given.

¹ Vid., *Concerning the Eirenic Method*, *E.C.Q.*, October 1939, p. 457, also *E.C.Q.*, January 1938, p. 38.

We take the heading,¹ eirenic method, first because it is often misunderstood ; especially in this country where either it is supposed to stand for compromise, or those who practise it are thought to live in a dream.

Eirenicism is described by Dom Clement Lialine² as the conciliatory attitude of a man who seeks the truth, towards another man or other men whom, rightly, he believes to be animated by the same dispositions as himself. This wide and intellectual outlook, he says, eliminates all narrow and sentimental imitations. In introducing his schema he says : " It pre-supposes two workers for reunion, of different faiths, one of which is taken hypothetically to be true." So there is no question of compromise. Here are a few other words of explanation. The eirenic method aims at eliminating *apparent* points of disagreement in different faiths, and at bringing out points of *real* disagreement. But the method is not all-powerful, nor is it naïvely optimistic, for it recognises its limitations : once the real and humanly irreducible disagreement between faiths is reached, only a *supernatural agency* can enable two workers for reunion to come to agreement. Hence the importance of seeking a *supernatural basis* so stressed in this paper, and also of the liturgical approach concerning which we will soon speak. The eirenic method seeks the truth but not in a purely logical and rational way, but from a standpoint which is much broader and, in a word, more filled with the sense of mystery. It is this attitude to truth and the search for truth which gives eirenicism its fundamental characteristic of respect and reverence, analogous to the sense of the holy. So it approaches the study of Tradition which is *materially* dispersed among the Christian communions, though *essentially* concentrated in the Catholic Church. It is precisely the function of the eirenic theologian to discern its authenticity, and to draw the manifold forms it assumes into the unity of the visible Church.

Now we will turn to consider the liturgical movement.³

If the eirenic method may be termed an attitude of mind, an " intellectual " approach to the problem of Christian unity,

¹ Cf. articles on *Concerning the Eirenic Method* by Dom Clement Lialine, *E.C.Q.*, April, July and October, 1939, also *Divided Christendom*, by Father M.-J. Congar, O.P., etc.

² Ref., *E.C.Q.*, 1939, as above.

³ Cf. There was a series of papers on *Liturgy and Reunion* in issues of the *E.C.Q.* for 1940.

the liturgy may be said to place us in the very heart of Christian unity, for we are dealing directly with the Mystical Body of Christ. The Mass is the centre of the liturgy, using the term in its largest sense, and is in the midst of the Church, offered by the priest and all the faithful, and is their bond of union with Christ and with one another, and this even if they do not go to communion. A moment's reflection on this will show us the profound importance of the liturgical approach to the question of the reunion of the dissident Eastern Churches with the Church of Rome. Here is already what has been termed an "inward reunion," based on a sacramental life in Christ; it only needs to be deepened and be consciously lived with a real desire for unity and the ground is prepared for the work of the Holy Ghost and for an eirenic approach to all the difficulties in the way of "outward unity."

But just as the Mass re-enacts the redemptive reality in its plenitude sacramentally, so does baptism initiate the individual into Christ's Mystical Body, and hence all baptised Christians share, in a *very special way* in this re-enacting of the *opus redemptionis*. Therefore one cannot lay too much stress on considering the Mass and the whole liturgical approach to things as the best possible centre from which to view and deal with the problems of Christian unity. To take but two examples. The one, the liturgy exemplifies in the most fundamental way the Church's unity in diversity—unity in Christ, in one Faith, and diversity in the variety of the ways of approaching God in worship—difference of rite and language as the expression of diverse human cultures, and this is not only an historical fact but one that may solve many problems of the future. The other, the liturgy is essentially the praying of dogma, and is in a very special way the prayer of the Holy Spirit in the Church and so a vital source of Tradition which is, above all, the study of the worker for Christian unity and of the eirenic theologian.

So far we have been considering Integral Catholicity under these two headings in the light of our approach to the other Christian bodies, but the consideration of their bearing on ourselves and on Catholics in general is of far greater importance, at any rate if you are to understand our ideals.

In speaking about the necessity on the part of the Church of showing forth the catholicity of the whole Christian inheritance, Father Congar says: "Is Christendom divided in us, while we live on part only of our inheritance? Does

the Anglican, used to reverent worship, see at our Masses wholehearted devotion and adoration? Does the Orthodox, in our theology, get the impression of a profounder search for truth? Does our apostolic work demonstrate the depth and largeness of the Church of Pentecost? Yet a real possibility of reunion presupposes the need for all of this." But this is nothing less than a reform in the Church. He replies: "Let us make no mistake, the movement began under Pius X, whose motto is 'Instaurare omnia in Christo.' What else is the liturgical movement, etc.? What else is the inward revival of Catholic theology in the sense of a more serious study of the sources, of the Eastern tradition, of a deeper contemplation of the mysteries, and a deliberate detachment from theological limitations due to the Counter-Reformation? All this is reform, with its quiet positive work . . . it is a return to the sources, a rising above the limitations which had been forced on us by circumstances, a new beginning of richer and fuller life."¹ This means that the individual worker, layman or priest, will deepen his own Catholic outlook and that first by a deepening of his own grasp of the liturgy (Roman and also Oriental) and especially his *liturgical outlook on life*—each according to his opportunities and abilities—and then later (if he is suited or has the time) he will take up some special subject (theology, philosophy, history, etc.), approaching it by the eirenic method. Now this may be done purely as an individual affair but, if so done, it will lose half its value. Let us still think in terms of a movement, of groups in a movement, and of individuals in such groups. These groups may be religious communities in the strict sense of the term, or simply a collection of laity and clergy round a review, or even a "community" of lay people bound together by a rule of life and ideals. This grouping of people together is important as in some way the living-out the liturgical life, the more conscious living of an integral Catholic life—the unity in diversity. It will of course be only right that in so far as it is a movement in the Church, all the religious orders *should in their own way* take part in it. This will mean on their part both a deepening of their own spirit and also an enlarging of it. One can observe this if one considers how, wherever the liturgical movement is *taken seriously* by the people and is *enabled to affect* a religious community or a parish, a deepening

¹ Ibid. supra., pp. 271, 272.

and an enlarging of the spiritual life is a result. Now most religious orders are dated and have a *special* work to do in the Church and doubtless will have a special work to do in the matter of Christian unity, but they will, in many cases, need a certain amount of readjusting for the work. In the case of the monks of St. Benedict, though a given monastery or congregation may be dated yet they are essentially more fitted to work for the Christian East since their origin is before the schism of East and West and they already inherit the tradition of the Eastern monks. These facts have ever been recognized by the popes. It seems to us, therefore, that the work for Christian unity should be either directly or indirectly in the hands of this monastic order in the years to come, hence it is not for nothing that the *E.C.Q.*, and the group round it, is inspired by these traditions which are both so long associated with the Christian East and dear to our English nation.

Both this conference and the pages of the *E.C.Q.* bear witness that this is no exclusive programme confined to the members of only one religious order. No, all are welcome in this work; it must come in a very real sense from the whole of the Church—the prayer, the desire and the deepening of the life of an integral Catholicism—yet it will need guidance, inspiration, and example of the community, of the groups that live near and are fed by the sources of Tradition, of the Fathers of East and West, of the liturgy where the great work of our redemption is ever re-enacted.

“Our hope is the Father, our refuge the Son, our shelter the Holy Ghost, Holy Trinity, glory to thee.
All our hope we put in thee, Mother of God; guard us
under thy sheltering protection.”

Prayer of St. Joannicius (abbot d. 846)
from the Byzantine Little Compline.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

Our last dealing with reviews was in 1942, but even so notices on the whole will be brief and some periodicals will be treated in a future issue.

CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Irénikon, 1940. Vol. XVII, Nos. 1—2.

Questions sur l'Eglise et son Unité, 1943.

It is a sign of more normal times to see *Irénikon* again. It also shows that the monks and their work carried on in spite of the war at their doors. We congratulate them. We will review later.

Orientalia Christiana Periodica, 1940—1944. Vol. VI—Vol. X, Nos. I—II.

These have just arrived. They will be reviewed later.

Voice of the Church, 1944. The last number of a complete issue we received before 1944 was that of December, 1941. Volume VIII, 1944, is an interesting issue. Father Chrysostom Tarasevitch has a series of articles on Christian Unity and they are in a very eirenic strain though not in any way compromising the Catholic position. He starts in the April issue outlining the two-fold work that should be done in this direction by Benedictine monks, namely that of enlightening Western Christians as to the Eastern Churches and at the same time showing forth the Catholic West to the Eastern Churches. There is the need of Benedictine monasteries both in the West and in the East, working in conjunction with one another if his plan is to succeed. This, of course, is based on the letter of Pope Pius XI to the Abbot Primate in 1924. He also quotes from a paper read at Malines in 1891 by Dom Gerard Van Caloen, who, speaking of the work of a Benedictine monastery in Greece, says: "There should be no question of making converts among them, of carrying on the work of proselytism in their midst. The monks must limit themselves to the task of organizing among them centres of prayer, of liturgy, of serious studies, etc." He enlarges on this. It is on this basis that the following articles are written; some of the titles will give an idea of the contents of the series:—"Long preparation is needed" (May); "Corporate Christian Union" (July)—this is a review of

Reunion Councils of the past and the reasons for their failure ; "Christian Unity" (September)—this is merely the object of aspirations as yet ; "St. Paul's idea of Christian Unity" (October) ; "Christ's own idea about Christian Unity" (December). These are short articles written in a popular style which is the tone of the periodical ; they should do much good. Throughout the year there has been another series : "An exposition of the Divine Liturgy—historical, dogmatic and sacramental," by John Dmitrevsky. Serge Bolshakoff supplies a page of "News." There are also other articles. We wish the work every success. It is still written partly in Russian and partly in English. We will review this year's issues later on.

Report of the Russian Mission, 1943—1945. This is a news bulletin of a few pages issued from 39, Roland Gardens, London, S.W.7. The latest issue (June, 1945) bears the title "The Catholic Russian Mission." In 1943 this bulletin was only the organ of the Russian Catholic Mission in Shanghai, and in this and the next issue (April, 1944) it is concerned with St. Michael's College and Father Wilcock's work. We have referred to this report in the April—June 1944 issue of the *E.C.Q.* They have been through very trying times ; but the latest message from Father Wilcock shows that he is safe. Since 1945 (i.e., for two issues, March and June, 1945), the bulletin is also concerned with the original Jesuit school run for Russian boys, St. George's College, once at Namur in Belgium, now in Paris where things have developed well. Here is some of Father Mailleux's latest report :—"Our work here is very interesting, largely on account of the direct contact it permits with the Orthodox. They are very numerous and very active in Paris, and—it must be recognized—since the time of their arrival (1920—25), they have had practically no contact with French Catholic circles ; hence multitudes of prejudices have arisen on both sides. I feel justified in saying that the work of our school has already been the cause of dissipating a number of these. Last year, Mgr. Beaussart, Bishop Auxiliary for non-nationals, was officially received in the Orthodox seminary in Paris." We learn from this last issue (June, 1945) that some sons of Orthodox priests are studying at the college and that a school for Russian girls has been opened under the direction of the Sisters of St. Clothilde. A month ago Father Mailleux say

they had a small exhibition of eikons which was visited by over twenty Orthodox priests.

St. George's was opened in Paris in the February of 1941. Father Kousmine-Karawaieff is now also in Paris.

Other Catholic reviews received :

Magnificat (Oxford).

Orate Fratres (Collegeville, Mon.).

The English Liturgist (Stoke-on-Trent).

NON-CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Sobornost', 1942—1945. We will review this in a later issue. *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1942—1944. This also will be reviewed later.

The Eastern Churches Broadsheet, 1944—1945. This is a continuation of *Stephen Graham's News Letter* which came to an end with its September-October issue in 1943. Mr. Graham had carried on from March, 1940. It was, as the editor said, called forth by the war in which it is felt to be of great urgency that spiritual values be kept clear. Its other chief object was to keep open channels of communication and thus give assurance of spiritual unity. We think it did both ; news was always forthcoming and the spiritual values were set out in the editorial. Our last review of this periodical was that of 1941. The issues of the two succeeding years kept to the same high standard. The *Broadsheet* carries on with a continuity of management—that of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. We are told that there will be a variety and flexibility in the make-up of its contents ; short articles and book reviews will from time to time be included. It has carried out its programmes. Its readers are kept very well informed of the activities of the various groups of Orthodox in Great Britain. There are Greeks, Russians, Serbs, Rumanians and Poles who all have their churches in London, as well as the Armenians. There are also Orthodox centres in Scotland (Poles) ; in Cardiff, Liverpool and Manchester there are Greek parishes ; the Armenians also have a church in Manchester.

There are some excellent short articles : "On the Social Work of the Russian Church in Exile"—specially in Paris, (September—October, 1944) ; "The Rumanian Church in

America" (January, 1945), which speaks of the good relations between the Uniate and Orthodox Rumanians; "The Social Activities of the Greek Church" (December, 1944). And the general news notes are good.

Orthodox Church Bulletin, 1942—1945. This keeps one posted with the official news in regard to the Orthodox Churches as seen by the Ministry of Information. It is often interesting and instructive reading.

We receive also :

The Star of the East (Travancore, South India).

Reunion, 1942—1944. Two numbers still come out every year. It maintains the object of The Confraternity of Unity, keeping Anglicans and Catholics in touch with one another. There is some very good reading matter.

The Pilot, 1942—1945. This periodical's main work is to prepare Anglicans for some sort of corporate union with the Holy See. It comes out monthly and is written for the people. It is the principal organ of the Church Unity Octave. May its circulation increase!

There have been quite a number of articles bearing on the Eastern Churches in relation to Rome, evidently intended to stress the point that a rapprochement with the Orthodox does not necessarily mean an anti-Roman front; it should mean a very sure way to reunion with the Holy See: a series on "The Council of Florence" (August, 1943—February, 1944); "The South Indian Scheme and Reunion with the Orthodox" (March—April, and July—October, 1944). There are many other articles on the problem of South India, and an article by Dr. S. H. Scott on "The Teaching of the Church of England" (October, 1943) shows how the Church of England is bound by the *First Four General Councils* and hence a common ground with Rome and the Orthodox. It is full of good things and well worth getting. (4s. a year. Editor, 35, Selby Road, Ealing, W.5).

The Bond of Peace, 1943—1945. This has been coming out not so regularly, but it perseveres!

The Presbyter. "A Journal of Confessional and Catholic Churchmanship." This is a monthly published by a group of Free Church theologians. First number, January, 1943.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

We offer our sincere congratulations to Father A. W. Hughes, W.F., Apostolic Delegate to Egypt and Palestine since 1942, on being consecrated bishop of Hieropolis. It was a unique consecration; it took place in the Franciscan church at Cairo; His Beatitude Cyril IX, Melkite Patriarch of Antioch, presided at the throne; the consecrator was the Vicar-Apostolic of the Delta of the Nile (Latin rite), and the co-consecrators were the bishop of Thebes (Coptic rite), and the Vicar Apostolic of the Suez Canal zone (Latin rite).

ENGLAND.

CECUMENICAL.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF ST. ALBAN AND ST. SERGIUS—St. Basil's House: A centre for reunion work and fellowship between Christians, Eastern and Western. 52, Ladbroke Grove, London, W.11.

It is intended to serve as a meeting place at which Christians of the East (Greeks, Russians, Jugoslavs, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Armenians and others) may regularly come together in fellowship with members of the Anglican communion and other Western Christians.

Only through the operation of the Holy Spirit can the schisms among Christians be healed; but Christians themselves must actively co-operate with the Holy Spirit, and make it clear that they sincerely desire that unity which is according to Christ's will.

Reunion work, like all other Christian endeavours, requires trained leaders, literature, and money for its various activities. St. Basil's House is one of the first centres to be specifically dedicated to such work.

The House will provide opportunities for common worship, social intercourse, conferences, and occasional lectures. Its promoters believe that such activities, directed in the first instance towards the attainment of mutual understanding, based on the comparative study of the Eastern and Western traditions, constitute an important step towards that effective co-operation among Christians which is so urgently needed by a world suffering from racial antagonisms, national competition and class rivalry.

1. *The Activities of the House.* The House contains an Eastern Orthodox Chapel. It has a library and rooms for

meetings and lectures. The members of the Staff will be glad to provide information and instruction on subjects relating to Christian Unity.

2. *Scholarships.* The House intends, when funds permit, to give scholarships to Christians from abroad desiring to study Church life in this country, and to assist Christians from Great Britain and Ireland who wish to acquaint themselves with Christianity in foreign lands.

3. *Hospitality.* The House also offers hospitality to visitors from abroad, as well as to all those who are interested in Eastern Christianity.

4. *Finance.* The House is supported by the subscriptions of the "Friends of St. Basil's House," and by donations from Churches and Societies interested in Reunion work.

U.S.A.

CATHOLIC.

"The Eastern Churches in the Post-War World" was the topic of the seventh annual conference on Eastern rites and liturgies sponsored by Fordham University, New York City. A pontifical concelebration of the Maronite Liturgy, with the anaphora of St. James the Apostle, was the climax of the conference. The Archbishop of New York presided in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, at what was the first time that a Maronite Liturgy had ever been celebrated in the cathedral. The concelebrants were the Chorepiscopus¹ Mansur Stephen, pastor of our Lady of Lebanon church, Brooklyn, the Chorepiscopus Elias Basile, pastor of St Ann's church, Pittsburgh, and Father Joseph Solomon, pastor of St. Ann's church, Scranton, Pa. Chorepiscopus Francis Wakim, pastor of St. Joseph's church, New York City, represented the Maronite Patriarch of Antioch, Mar Antony Peter Arida. Attending the Archbishop of New York were Archimandrite Bernard G'hosn, representing the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch, the Vartapet Pascal Maljian, representing the Catholic Armenians, and Father Andrew Rogosh, representing the Catholic Russians.

¹ "Chorepiscopus," is a title of honour in several rites, sometimes with duties attached; he is not now a bishop, but was originally an auxiliary or coadjutor in episcopal orders. Maronite chorepiscopi are empowered to confirm, consecrate churches and altars, confer the lesser orders, and so forth.

The topic of the conference was developed by three speakers. "The Present State of the Eastern Churches" was the subject of Father Clement C. Englert, C.S.S.R., professor at St. Mary's College, North East, and Mgr. Thomas J. McMahon, S.T.D., national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, discussed "The Eastern Churches in the Islamic World." The third talk, "Russia and the Eastern Churches," was given by Father Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., editor of *Thought*.

PAMPHLETS FROM THE U.S.A.

There is a further set of pamphlets published by the Catholic Near East Welfare Association in New York—*What's in a Pope's Name?*, *God Wills It!*, about the Christian East and the Moslem world respectively—but there is a real connection. Also *Living Twig of Christ's Vine though little Known*, published at the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary, Stamford, Connecticut. An explanation of the Holy Liturgy, popular and with illustrations, by Father D. A. Schmal, S.J., *One Fold and One Shepherd*, radio addresses by Bishop Ambrose Senyshyn.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir,

I have read the letter of J.D.C. in your last issue with interest and, as a constant reader of the *E.C.Q.*, I hope you will allow me to take up two of the points raised. The first is that: "Dr. Lampert seems to hold a monism quite incompatible with Catholic teaching and apparently as a consequence, holds that the world is *necessary* to God."

And then the complaint at the end of the letter—that readers of the *E.C.Q.* are not given a fair chance of learning what the views of Dr. Lampert are, although the reviewer says that it is "an important book." It is in the hope of obtaining some enlightenment from the author of the book himself that I write this letter and pose herein some questions.

As regards the first, it should be noted that the author treats of monism (chapter 1) and shows it to be quite alien

to the idea of creation. And also that at the end of his chapter on dualism he says: "If dualism is overcome consistently, are we not threatened with a certain *divine* monism, which is simply a counterpart and converse of atheistic or cosmic monism? . . . It seems, there is no intellectual issue out of this dilemma." But he adds: "This can indeed only be found by taking the whole question on to another level, from the static to the dynamic, from the abstract to the concrete" (p. 15). And from this he launches his thesis. If, as it is difficult thinking and there seem to be contradictions in consequence, perhaps it were better first to question Dr. Lampert from his own side, than to try to straighten out his thought on Western lines. In regard, then, to whether he considers *that the world is necessary to God*, I should feel inclined to ask him whether he is in agreement with the late Father Sergius Bulgakov on this question. I will quote from the only book of his in English dealing with Sophiology, *The Wisdom of God*: "Nevertheless, though the positive principle on which the world is based belongs to the being of God, the world as such maintains its existence and its identity, distinct from that of God. Although its whole being depends upon the divine power of the creaturely Sophia within it, nevertheless the world is not God, but only God's creature. There is no such ontological necessity for the world as could constrain God himself to create it for the sake of his own development or fulfilment; such an idea would indeed be pure pantheism. On the contrary God creates the world in the freedom of his superabundant love. The self-sufficiency of God's being is completely realized in the tri-hypostatic life of the consubstantial Deity; nothing else can add to it or give it further fulfilment. In this sense, that is, for his own sake, God does not need the world." (pp. 110—111).

Surely the principal reason for our statement that the world is not *necessary* to God, is to save God's freedom and to guard against pantheism; this Father Bulgakov does.

As regards the second point; many other questions should be asked in order to extract the leading ideas of Dr. Lampert's valuable book, particularly on the *sacrament* which is the leading theme of the thesis.

But I would still like to ask a question, as J.D.C. puts it, "of wider importance." Is what may be called the sophiological outlook on Orthodox theology confined to a few

Russian scholars or has it got disciples among Greek and Rumanian theologians? After all, the modern authority on Gregory Palamas at Mount Athos is a Russian monk, Father Basil Krivoshein, or has he followers among other Orthodox Churches?

Yours, etc.,

K.F.E.W.

BOOKS RECEIVED

S.P.C.K. *Orthodox Spirituality*, by a monk of the Eastern Church.

A Manual of Eastern Orthodox Prayers.

St. Augustine's Episcopate. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson.

The Polish Research Centre: *Eastern Poland; The Story of
of Wilno; and Lwow.*